EXHIBIT 14

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

- x

In the Matter of:

	Chapter 11
MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, et al, f/k/a General Motors Corp., et al.,	Case No.: 09-50026(REG) (Jointly Administered)

Debtors.

- x

STEVEN GROMAN, ROBIN DELUCO, ELIZABETH Y. GRUMET, ABC FLOORING, INC., MARCUS SULLIVAN, KATELYN SAXSON, AMY C. CLINTON, AND ALLISON C. CLINTON, on behalf of themselves, and all other similarly situated,	Adv. Pro. No.: 14-01929(REG)

Plaintiffs,

v.

GENERAL MOTORS LLC,

Defendant.

- x

U.S. Bankruptcy Court

One Boling Green

New York, New York

May 2, 2014

9:46 AM

B E F O R E :

HON ROBERT E. GERBER

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Hearing re: Status Conference

Transcribed by: Dawn South and Sheila Orms

A P P E A R A N C E S :

KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorneys for General Motors LLC
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-4003

BY: ARTHUR J. STEINBERG, ESQ.
SCOTT DAVIDSON, ESQ.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS
Attorney for New GM
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654

BY: RICHARD C. GODFREY, P.C., ESQ.

GOLENBOCK EISEMAN ASSOR BELL & PESKOE LLP
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs
437 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

BY: JONATHAN FLAXER, ESQ.
S. PRESTON RICARDO, ESQ.

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Attorney for Motors Liquidation GUC Trust
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193

BY: KEITH R. MARTORANA, ESQ.

ROBINSON CALCAGNIE ROBINSON SHAPIRO DAVIS, INC.
Attorney for Ratzlaff, et al.
19 Corporate Plaza Drive
Newport Beach, CA 92660

BY: MARK P. ROBINSON, JR., ESQ.

GOODWIN ROCTER LLP
Attorneys for the South Texas Plaintiffs
The New York Times Building
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018

BY: WILLIAM P. WEINTRAUB, ESQ.
EAMONN O'HAGAN, ESQ.

BROWN RUDNICK LLP
Attorneys for Ratzlaff, et al.
Seven Times Square
New York, NY 10036

BY: EDWARD WEISFELNER, ESQ.
DAVID J. MOLTON, ESQ.
HOWARD STEEL, ESQ.

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
Attorneys for Holders of Units in the GUC Trust
One Bryant Park
New York, NY 10036-6745

BY: NAOMI MOSS, ESQ.
DANIEL GOLDEN, ESQ.

OTTERBOURG
230 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10169

BY: DAVID M. POSNER, ESQ.

LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs Darby and Jones
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068

BY: JOHN K. SHERWOOD, ESQ.

LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs Darby and Jones
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

BY: MICHAEL S. ETKIN, ESQ.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Attorney for the U.S. Trustee
U.S. Federal Office Building
201 Varick Street
Suite 1006
New York, NY 10014

BY: BRIAN MASUMOTO, ESQ.

CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED
One Thomas Circle, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

BY: PETER VAN N. LOCKWOOD, ESQ.

CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED
600 Lexington Avenue
21st Floor
New York, NY 10022-7619

BY: ELIHU INSELBUCH, ESQ.

STUZMAN, BROMBERG, ESSERMAN & PLIFKA
2323 Bryan Street
Suite 2200
Dallas, TX 75201-2689

BY: SANDER L. ESSERMAN, ESQ.

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178

BY: BENJAMIN D. FEDER, ESQ.

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES
Attorney for Plaintiffs
780 Third Avenue
36th Floor
New York, NY 10017-2024

BY: MARIA A. BOVE, ESQ.

BECNEL LAW FIRM, LLC
Attorney for Jomaka Coleman, et al.
425 West Airline Highway
Suite B
Laplace, LA 70068

BY: DANIEL BECNEL, JR., ESQ. (TELEPHONIC)

the things like selection of lead counsel, the things that we can agree are purely administrative, and we should defer consideration of the amended complaint issue until the next status conference.

THE COURT: But matters of the character that the MDL could appropriately determine in your view could include whether the pretrial proceedings take place in say California on the one hand or New York on the other?

MR. STEINBERG: For the MDL I think the MDL should be able to select which forum is going to go forward on generally the MDL action to the extent that the MDL action will ever go forward.

THE COURT: Okay. Continue, please.

MR. STEINBERG: The -- Your Honor, with regard to the -- your tentative ruling on the stipulated record and that we don't do admissions, that is essentially what we have been trying to urge on the plaintiffs.

One of the issues was that we had discussions separately with one group versus another group and they had differing views on certain issues. And even with the group that had a larger issue what we were getting to some extent was the lowest common denominator. When you have 15 people having suggestions sometimes you get 15 suggestions because no one really wants to whittle it down and they leave it up to us to do it.

We urge to do a stipulated record under the theory that it's too early to do admissions, it is a -- really just a cost shifting issue as Your Honor had identified, and it leads to a dialogue. If they -- if they propose that they want us to agree to something instead of me answering as I would answer an admission I'd be sitting there saying I can't do that but I can do something different and then we would have an iterative dialogue to be able to try to present what the issues are and then I wouldn't have to try to do the reflexive issue, which is that if you want admissions then maybe I have admissions that I want to ask of you. Did you know of the bankruptcy proceeding? Did you know of a problem with your car? Those things and try to identify those issues, which may be relevant to certain of the issues whether it's -- that they may tangentially relate to the fraud on the Court issue, which may be off the table now, but -- so I said stay with the stipulation and if we can't agree to it we'll have a status conference in June and we'll tell the judge this is as far as we could get and we couldn't get all the way there, and if we couldn't agree on everything then you could propose what kind of limited discovery you think you need to conclude those facts that are necessary to determine the purely legal issue. We'll be able to evaluate it. And then if we can't agree with that we'd be before Your Honor on something specific and

concrete.

And the problem that we were having between now and May 2nd is that there was a lot of general propositions that were asserted and many times the devil is in the detail, and you need to know when someone says it's purely administrative it's not substantive you really need to know what they are talking about. When people say we can agree to some facts and it's not going to be big, it's going to be narrowly tailored you need to know what someone means when they say narrowly tailored, because when actually try to pin it down it becomes a lot more difficult.

So what we were proposing -- and I think there was a lot of receptivity on it from the other side -- was a walk and then run, which is give us a chance to try to do an exchange and we'll see how good we are, and give us a chance if we can't fill in all the gaps to how to complete the discovery and we'll see how good we are, and if we can't do it then I know that you're going to bridge the gap for us and then we'll both live with whatever Your Honor rules. And we're only looking to defer that consideration where we otherwise couldn't agree for like a six or seven-week period.

And the reason why we think that time period going a little longer versus shorter is better -- and I think Your Honor eluded to that as one of your tentative rulings that

sometimes things take a little longer and these serious issues -- is that until we know how they've organized -- and it's really their job to organize, but it's our burden to make sure that we're dealing with 2 groups of people, 4 groups of people, or 20 groups of people, because it becomes harder to figure out briefing schedules, potential discovery, stipulation of facts if we don't know who the people are that we're dealing with you may need to have a little more time until they get better organized to be able to do that. That's why we actually suggest in our agenda letter is just tell us if you formed a group. That has the salutary effect of at least we know who we're dealing with and Your Honor will know whether they actually formed the group, and those who decide they want to be outliers well then they will have to stand up and tell Your Honor why they need to be an outlier and the liaison groups couldn't properly be formed.

But that's all we were trying to say on that issue, which is give them an opportunity to get themselves organized and let us know how successful you were, and where you were not fully successful just let us know because we -- we on our side of the table procedurally have to deal if they're not fully organized and then ultimately Your Honor will have that same issue about how things are being presented to Your Honor.

With regard to -- so that's why we thought we needed a little more time. And by the way, the dates that we selected in our letter were given to us by one of the plaintiff groups, and the other plaintiff group actually said, while they shortened our dates, they also said in their letter that they're flexible about the dates. So I don't think ultimately at the end of the day we're going to disagree about dates, about when we're going to be here.

I think the general proposition is that between now and some time in mid to late June when we'll have another status conference we're going to try to accomplish a stipulated record for briefing the threshold issues and to see whether there's any discovery that is it warranted or not with regard to that stipulated record.

And I would suggest also, and this is off my agenda letter, but picking off on the tentative ruling, trying to identify during that period of time the other issues which are not threshold issues, the other bankruptcy-related issues that we'd ask Your Honor to consider, and we'd be doing all of that presentation at the next status conference. And at that next status conference, to the extent that the defendants are not fully organized, that we would try to -- and it wouldn't be me, but it would be Your Honor and the plaintiffs -- try to figure out how they can, you know, get to the end to themselves more fully organized.

The tentative that you had about the GUC Trust, late-filed claims, excusable neglect, we actually think that this is an issue that should be dealt with. It is not our issue, but to the extent that they've raised or some of them have raised a procedural due process issue relating to the bar order, which was after the sale order had taken place and they're saying that they don't have a remedy -- an effective remedy against Old GM, well there is a GUC Trust, there are a number of -- there's a number of values still left in the GUC Trust. Whether they actually are a creditor, where they actually have excusable neglect I'm not trying to prejudge it, but we were urging that they shouldn't just assume that there was nothing there when there is potentially something there and they should be able to and should be almost in fact required to at least explore that as an alternative to try to get a recovery, if they're entitled to a recovery. I wasn't trying to say that they were or not.

As far as the suggestion of mediation, it is always hard to say that you're against mediation. The only thing that I would say, Your Honor, is that New GM has hired Ken Feinberg, who is a very well known person who tries to figure out how to deal with circumstances and to how to adjust situations on a non-legal base, but to try to negotiate a resolution.

MR. MARTORANA: Your Honor, I stand because you had suggested at the outset of this hearing the possibility that issues related to the GUC Trust and claims against the GUC Trust might be better addressed as a threshold issue to start.

Based upon what I'm hearing today, it sounds like there's a consensus among the parties here at least, that this is something that should not be addressed as a threshold issue.

THE COURT: Well, that depends on who you're including within that consensus, Mr. Martorana.

MR. MARTORANA: I meant just these parties over here. Don't -- you would like to have it addressed to the threshold issue?

UNIDENTIFIED: I'll address it later.

MR. MARTORANA: Okay. All right. Then I guess there is no consensus on that, but I will tell you that from our perspective, we believe that it should not be addressed as a threshold issue.

We do believe that first off it will require at least some discovery, probably substantial discovery. We also believe, you know, particularly because as it relates to issues of excusable neglect, which are fact sensitive.

We also believe that it's not dispositive of -- as Mr. Weisfelner said the -- you know, the fundamental issue

here which is whether or not claims can be asserted against New GM.

Moving off it being a threshold issue, we also don't believe that this is an issue frankly that needs to be addressed at any point during this hearing -- during this proceeding.

No claimants, none of the plaintiffs, no claimants or potential claimants had raised this as a possibility. No one has filed a motion to lift the bar date. The only person that has raised it has been New GM, based upon, you know, some statements of fact in some pleadings. But the only person that has actually moved forward with it is New GM, and frankly, you know, it's our view that this is essentially a way to deflect liability away, and you know, the attention away from New GM and put it on to a third party.

To the extent that Your Honor is inclined to rule against us and have it either be dealt with as a threshold issue or as a -- I guess, a subsequent issue, we would request to participate in any of the discovery that does transpire. And then to the extent that there are any claims against New GM to be resolved, we would also ask to participate in any mediation.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FLAXER: Thank you.